

# Proposal for a tailored monitoring approach for fragile and conflict affected situations

17<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting  
26-27 March 2019 – Kampala, Uganda

This document is a background document for the 17th Steering Committee meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Shaped by deliberations of an Open Working Group (OWG), the document will inform a discussion of the Steering Committee on next steps for tailoring Global Partnership monitoring to fragile and conflict affected situations.

**Contact:**

Ms. Rebekah Chew, Tel: +33 1 45 24 15 66, e-mail: [Rebekah.CHEW@oecd.org](mailto:Rebekah.CHEW@oecd.org)

Ms. Piper HART, Tel: +1 212 906 5259, e-mail: [Piper.HART@undp.org](mailto:Piper.HART@undp.org)

# 1. Background

## What?

Realising the ambition of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development requires both adequate resources, as set out in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, and adherence to international commitments<sup>i</sup> on delivering resources effectively to maximize the potential of each dollar spent and ensure long-lasting development results. In response to new and evolving challenges that development actors are facing, the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation is adapting how it monitors effective development co-operation, beginning with a focus on fragility and conflict affected situations in order to spur dialogue and action on bottlenecks to delivering effectively in fragile contexts through more relevant and useful data, and a timely feedback loop.

### **What is fragility? And who is affected?**

The 2016 OECD States of Fragility report defines fragility as the combination of exposure to risk in five areas - economic, environmental, political, social and security - and the insufficient capacity of the state or system to manage, absorb or mitigate those risks<sup>ii</sup>. In this document, 'fragile contexts' is shorthand for countries that are exposed to some level of these risks, particularly political, economic, social and security risks. In addition to multiple dimensions<sup>iii</sup>, a broad spectrum of fragility exists; from severely affected by conflict to relative resilience and stability. This work recognizes that effectiveness principles apply in all country contexts; noting that the principles can be incrementally applied in parallel to improvements in country context<sup>iv</sup>. For example, in extremely fragile contexts, focus may be on upholding accountability and transparency, demonstrated through political dialogue and mutual accountability. In other contexts that are less fragile, the full range of effectiveness principles would be monitored and focus might be on tracking progress on country ownership through alignment with national priorities, or use of country systems. Experience from past Monitoring Rounds of the Global Partnership confirms that countries that are actively engaged in severe conflict, do not request to participate. Where monitoring is feasible, however, irrespective of the baseline, tracking progress on effectiveness is critical to engaging in meaningful dialogue on what actions need to be taken to improve the effectiveness of development partnerships, which will ultimately lead to long lasting development gains. Global Partnership monitoring is conducted on a voluntary, country-led basis. As the monitoring exercise is country-led, there have been instances where the government requests to participate yet some development partners choose not to engage with the government on the exercise. Where this has occurred, data for the country includes government data and data from the development partners that choose to report to the government.

## Why?

The development of a monitoring approach that is tailored to fragile contexts responds to calls to adapt Global Partnership monitoring to remain relevant in the context of the 2030 Agenda and the commitment to leave no one behind. Following the 2016 Global Partnership monitoring round, feedback received from countries in fragile situations<sup>v</sup> was that Global Partnership monitoring needs to be better tailored to fragile and conflict affected contexts. Around the same time, the renewed mandate of the Global Partnership reaffirmed the relevance of existing effectiveness principles, but stressed the need to "update the existing monitoring framework to reflect the challenges of the 2030 Agenda, including the pledge to leave no-one behind"<sup>vi</sup>. In response, as an initial step, the Global Partnership completed a comprehensive refinement exercise in 2017 to strengthen the current monitoring indicators<sup>vii</sup>. Taking a next step to adapting its monitoring, the Global Partnership is now looking at how the monitoring exercise could be better adapted to new and evolving challenges, starting with the development of a tailored monitoring approach for fragile contexts.

## How?

In April 2018, the Global Partnership Steering Committee endorsed the contours for adapting Global Partnership monitoring with an initial focus on fragility with the aim that subsequent themes will follow, and requested that an open working group be set up to guide the development of a proposed monitoring approach tailored to fragile and conflict affected situations. Following the development of a concept note<sup>viii</sup>, an open working group was set up in mid-2018. The open working group has guided the development of this proposal, which includes inputs from three key constituencies<sup>ix</sup>: partner countries<sup>x</sup>; development partners<sup>xi</sup>; and, civil society<sup>xii</sup>. In addition, several Global Partnership Steering Committee members are also engaged on the open working group (see endnote for a full list of members)<sup>xiii</sup>.

## Progress made

To ensure that the most critical and relevant actions are tracked to deliver useful data, the open working group first considered the most pressing challenges to upholding existing international commitments for effective development co-operation in fragile contexts and then focussed on the actions needed to address these challenges and how they could be monitored. This ensures that the proposed approach adequately captures and addresses 'what' needs to be monitored in addition to 'how' the monitoring is carried out in these contexts. With regards to the latter, building on the experiences of past and current monitoring rounds as well as inputs from the open working group, possible improvements to the monitoring process are detailed in the section below. This is a starting point; further reflection and additional improvements will be considered together during the stock-taking and lessons learned following the 2018 Global Partnership monitoring round. This will enable improvements to the monitoring process for all participating countries to be considered alongside those that might be specific for fragile contexts.

In assessing 'what' needs to be monitored, the open working group identified four key challenges to upholding international commitments for effective development co-operation in fragile contexts: lack of trust, fragmentation, weak humanitarian, development and peace coherence, and weak country ownership<sup>xiv</sup>. The working group recognised that while these challenges are not exclusive to fragile contexts, they are often more pronounced.

Drilling down on the actions needed to address the challenges identified, the open working group outlined six critical action areas around which a monitoring approach could be developed. These six critical action areas include: setting and aligning with national priorities; mutual accountability; use of country systems; inclusive processes to strengthen government legitimacy; strengthening national capacity; and humanitarian, development, peace coherence. The first three action areas are currently covered by Global Partnership monitoring. The current approach to tracking progress in these areas could be improved through adjustments that tailor to fragile contexts, as detailed in Table 1 below. The latter three areas are not currently covered.

In November 2018, the Global Partnership Steering Committee appreciated the progress made and welcomed the six action areas identified by the working group. In early 2019, the open working group discussed possible monitoring approaches that could be employed under each of the six action areas. Noting that improvements to the monitoring process (the 'how') will be further considered during the stock-taking and lessons learned following the 2018 monitoring round, this document sets out below initial thinking on improvements to the process and the content (the 'what') of a tailored monitoring approach for fragile and conflict affected situations as proposed by the open working group for the consideration of the Global Partnership Steering Committee. This concludes the first phase of work. Under the direction of the Global Partnership Steering Committee, the

second phase of work is outlined below in the section on next steps; including, detailing the indicator methodologies and looking more closely at what improvements are needed with regard to the monitoring process.

## 2. Proposed monitoring approach

The intended outcome of this proposed adapted monitoring approach is to allow for a leaner and less burdensome monitoring process for fragile and conflict affected situations that is more attuned to the realities of their development co-operation contexts. Properly applied, this approach will provide an improved feedback loop on where progress is being made, and spur dialogue and action where the bottlenecks lie to implementing existing international commitments in fragile contexts.

The proposed approach retains the key features of Global Partnership monitoring: that is, it is voluntary, country-led, and based on multi-stakeholder engagement. Improvements made to Global Partnership monitoring during the development of this tailored approach for fragile contexts could inform improvements to Global Partnership monitoring for all participating countries. Where useful, newly developed monitoring approaches that are relevant for all contexts could be picked up when preparations are underway for the next Global Partnership monitoring round.

### a) Possible improvements to the process

As part of the stocktaking and lessons learned that take place following each monitoring round, it is planned that a review of the monitoring process, including how it could be improved for fragile and conflict affected situations, would be considered together with the overall stocktaking for all participating countries following the 2018 monitoring round. However, preliminary thinking on how to improve the monitoring process in fragile contexts, based on feedback from open working group members, experiences of past and current Monitoring Rounds and availability of data, includes the following:

- **Greater in-kind technical assistance** at country level to support a multi-stakeholder process and strengthen national systems and processes. While willingness to participate can be high, pronounced challenges in fragile contexts relating to capacity, competing priorities, and technical limitations among others, calls for consideration of additional support in country to support the monitoring process. This could be a key development partner that provides technical support to the government, champions the exercise among stakeholders in country, and supports a smooth, inclusive, high-quality data collection process. The monitoring exercise, and the multi-stakeholder process, is in itself a useful capacity strengthening exercise, which provides benefits in terms of the monitoring results but also significant value in terms of building relationships and trust, as well as strengthening national mechanisms.
- **An improved reporting tool** that is more adaptable to different country contexts, and directs respondents through the monitoring framework based on how they answer the indicator questions (i.e. asking additional questions where relevant and skipping on to the next section where there is no additional information to provide). For development partners, where a decision is taken not to engage with the government on the monitoring exercise, the monitoring tool could set out an initial question on engagement and relationship with the government before the remaining questions are asked. This would provide space for development partners to flag where they have chosen not to engage with the government. For partner country governments, recognising the complementarity between the

proposed approach for fragile contexts and the existing Global Partnership framework, a monitoring approach for fragile contexts that is entirely separate from other participating countries is not desired. It is envisaged that the proposed approach – as well as subsequent tailored approaches that could be developed - would be weaved into the overarching Global Partnership monitoring framework in such a way that enables partner countries to respond to aspects that are relevant to their country context and not report on areas that are not relevant. For example, in response to indicator 1B on strengthening national development strategies, if a partner country indicates that they have conducted a fragility assessment or national cohesion strategy, further questions would probe on the quality, inclusiveness and relevance of the assessment. If the country does not indicate that this type of assessment has been carried out, the follow-up questions would be skipped. This will require a rethinking of how the monitoring tool is constructed and reported on to be more flexible and responsive to country context. It is proposed that this reconceptualising of the monitoring tool be considered together with possible improvements to the monitoring process during the stocktaking that will take place following the 2018 Global Partnership monitoring round.

As noted above, these possible improvements to the process are a starting point. Further reflection and additional improvements will be considered together during the stock-taking and lessons learned following the 2018 Global Partnership monitoring round.

## b) Tailoring the content

The proposed monitoring approach is summarised below in Table 1. The table sets out the suggested indicators for inclusion in an adapted monitoring approach, which monitors a smaller set of focussed effectiveness issues in fragile contexts as compared to the existing Global Partnership monitoring framework. The final section of this paper, the Annex, provides greater detail on how each of these indicators would be further developed into detailed indicator methodologies pending endorsement of the Global Partnership Steering Committee on the broad direction of the proposed approach.

Legend for Table 1

	Existing Global Partnership area. Text in blue indicates where changes to existing Global Partnership indicators are suggested. See Annex for further details on what is new/changed.
	New area not currently covered by Global Partnership monitoring.

Table 1. Proposed approach to monitoring effectiveness in fragile and conflict affected situations

Indicator	Measurement	Data source	
		Existing global data	Collected at country level
<b>Action area: Mutual accountability</b>			
Mutual accountability among development actors is strengthened	% of partner countries that have an <b>inclusive mechanism in place for dialogue on development co-operation (distinct from political dialogue in that it addresses accountability with regards to roles and responsibilities of actors engaged in development partnerships)</b>		•

Indicator	Measurement	Data source	
		Existing global data	Collected at country level
through inclusive dialogue	<p>Criteria: whether the mechanism for dialogue on development co-operation is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. held regularly, with appropriate counterparts</li> <li>ii. results-orientated,</li> <li>iii. transparent, where development co-operation data/information is actively shared a) within the coordinating mechanism (or mutual assessment/ portfolio review), with all partners, including civil society; b) regularly recorded within the national aid management system; and c) is publically available</li> <li>iv. and inclusive, including whether sub-national government, civil society and other actors are engaged</li> </ul>		
<b>Action area: Political dialogue</b>			
Foster legitimate politics through regular political dialogue	[Placeholder for political dialogue – distinct from dialogue on development co-operation in that it addresses political concerns, security, legitimacy among other issues – with development partners and civil society, which could be tracked at international, regional, country and/or local level]		
<b>Action area: Alignment with national priorities / strengthening national capacity</b>			
Countries strengthen national development planning tools/ frameworks	<p>% of partner country governments that strengthen evidence-based national development planning tools/ frameworks</p> <p>Criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Whether a national conflict/risk/resilience/cohesion assessment or other relevant assessment has been conducted through inclusive dialogue with civil society, subnational groups and communities, and whether it has been used to inform and underpin national development planning; or</li> <li>ii) Whether the national development planning document (where it exists): responds to the issues raised in the national conflict/risk/resilience/cohesion assessment or other relevant assessment (where it has been conducted); has been developed through inclusive dialogue; is used to define and track the country's development priorities; is monitored regularly and transparently; and, is used to inform decision making</li> </ul>		•
Development partners use existing country-led tools/ frameworks	% of development partners that use existing country-led tools/ frameworks		•
Development partners strengthen national capacities	[Placeholder to track the effectiveness of strengthening national capacities to plan, implement and evaluate development activities]		

Indicator	Measurement	Data source	
		Existing global data	Collected at country level
Reduce redundancy and overlap of actors and activities	[Placeholder for measurement approach to track the reduction of fragmentation of actors and activities]		
<b>Action area: Use of country systems</b>			
Partner countries strengthen the quality of their public financial management systems	Improvements in select PEFA scores over time	•	
Development partners use and strengthen country systems	<p>Use and strengthen country systems</p> <p>Sub-elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <a href="#">Disbursements to the public sector as a proportion of total bilateral disbursements in country</a></li> <li>ii. Portion of aid on budget: share of development co-operation funds planned for the country's public sector that was recorded in the annual budget submitted for legislative approval</li> <li>iii. <a href="#">Core support to national civil society organisations</a></li> <li>iv. Development co-operation flows that are channeled through a country's public financial management systems as a proportion of disbursement to the public sector</li> </ul>		•
<b>Action area: Humanitarian-development-peace coherence</b>			
Foster humanitarian-development-peace coherence	Interim measure to track humanitarian-development-peace coherence (to be included in indicator 1A and 1B) [Placeholder for which a monitoring approach could be developed once agreed actions are in place, including monitoring the recently adopted DAC Recommendation on Humanitarian–Development–Peace Nexus ]		•

### 3. Next Steps

Table 1 above sets out the broad substantive direction of the proposed, tailored approach to monitoring effective development co-operation in fragile and conflict affected situations. This proposal, which presents a smaller set of focussed effectiveness challenges in fragile contexts as compared to the existing Global Partnership monitoring framework, concludes the first phase of work. The second phase of work, and proposed next steps, include the following:

- **The development of measurement approaches and indicator methodologies.** Table 1 above provides an indication of the broad direction of the proposed monitoring approach for fragile contexts. More work is needed to develop measurement approaches for the placeholders, as well as detailed methodologies for each indicator in consultation with partner countries and key stakeholders to ensure that the methodologies reflect what is useful and meaningful to track, as well as available, at country level. The Annex (below) provides greater detail on how each of the proposed indicators would be further developed into detailed indicator methodologies.
- **A review of the monitoring process for fragile contexts.** As part of the stocktaking and lessons learned that take place following each monitoring round, it is planned that a review of the monitoring process and how it could be improved for fragile and conflict affected situations would be considered together with the overall stocktaking for all participating countries following the 2018 monitoring round.
- **Reconceptualising the Global Partnership monitoring tool.** A more flexible monitoring tool could allow for the proposed approach to be weaved into the overarching Global Partnership monitoring framework in such a way that enables partner countries and development partners to respond to aspects that are relevant to their country context and skip over those areas that are not relevant. It is already current practice that not all countries report on all areas. However, improvements to the reporting tool could be made to make it more user-friendly.

**The Steering Committee is invited to provide feedback and strategic guidance** on the proposed monitoring approach, particularly on the following questions:

- **Among the six agreed areas, is there a need to be more selective or add components to adequately cover the six critical action areas? Are there key issues/stakeholders that require greater attention?**
- **How can the tailored approach for fragility be best integrated into one comprehensive monitoring exercise? Do you foresee benefits/limitations with the proposal to revise the monitoring tool in such a way that allows for relevant questions to be asked, and others to be skipped?**
- **What considerations need to be accounted for in revising the monitoring process for fragile contexts together with stocktaking that will take place for all participating countries following the 2018 monitoring round?**

It is anticipated that the tailored monitoring approach for fragile contexts will be shared with the international community at the Global Partnership's Senior-Level Meeting in July 2019 to demonstrate how the Global Partnership is adapting to evolving challenges related to implementation of the 2030 Agenda. The discussions at the Senior-Level Meeting will benefit from the monitoring results and experiences of around half of the countries participating in the 2018 monitoring round, which are considered to be affected by some dimension of fragility<sup>xv</sup>. This includes all 20 g7+ countries. Highlighting the specific needs and challenges of fragility ties in with the Sustainable Development Goals under review at the 2019 UN High-Level Political Forum, which includes Goal 16 on promote peaceful and inclusive societies and build effective institutions.

With oversight and strategic guidance of the Global Partnership Steering Committee, the second phase of work will likely continue beyond July 2019 and the Global Partnership's Senior-Level Meeting. This would not affect the ability to share the newly tailored approach with the international community, as well as engage with and put a spotlight on the unique needs and challenges of fragile contexts at the Senior-Level Meeting. Rather it would enable key stakeholders to continue to provide feedback on the detailed indicator methodologies as they are being fleshed out. It is envisaged that the tailored approach would be rolled out in the next monitoring round of the Global Partnership, likely to take place in 2021, with planning for the next monitoring round kicking off in 2020. The next steps included in the second phase of this work, including the development of indicator methodologies, consideration for a more flexible monitoring tool and improvements for the monitoring process, will feed into the overall preparations for the next monitoring round.

## ANNEX – DETAIL ON HOW THE PROPOSED INDICATORS WOULD BE DEVELOPED

This annex provides further information and direction on how the proposed indicators outlined in Table 1 would be developed into indicator methodologies, in close consultation with key stakeholders in a strategic selection of countries that have participated in the 2018 Monitoring Round to ensure that the proposed monitoring approach is grounded in reality at country level.

For each proposed indicator in Table 1, there is a brief explanation of what the indicator refers to, the rationale for its inclusion in the proposed approach, and the broad outlines of a measurement approach and/or – particularly where there is a placeholder – further information on what type of measurement approach could be explored. The proposed measurement approaches utilise existing Global Partnership monitoring approaches where feasible and build on lessons learned from past Global Partnership monitoring rounds. As with the work to date, any more detailed measurement and construction of each indicator will be subject to subsequent review and endorsement by the Global Partnership Steering Committee.

<b>Mutual accountability</b>	<b>Mutual accountability among development actors is strengthened through inclusive dialogue</b>
------------------------------	--

### **Background**

Linking to the need for political dialogue, the open working group recognized the importance of mutual accountability, which can be facilitated through a mechanism to set, discuss and follow-up on agreed roles and responsibilities. Mutual accountability is critical to building trust. Mutual accountability frameworks that detail roles and responsibilities of partner country governments, development partners and civil society, and include regular reviews of the framework, are an effective mechanism to hold one another to account on commitments in a more accessible and transparent manner. Where a mutual accountability framework has not been established, an inclusive mechanism for dialogue on development co-operation provides an informal mechanism for mutual accountability, and can be a starting point toward establishing a more formally agreed mutual accountability framework.

**Proposed approach:** % of partner countries that have an inclusive mechanism in place for dialogue on development co-operation

*Criteria: whether the mechanism in place for dialogue on development co-operation is:*

*i) held regularly, with appropriate counterparts*

*ii) results-orientated,*

*iii) transparent, where development co-operation data/information is actively shared a) within the coordinating mechanism (or mutual assessment/ portfolio review), with all partners, including civil society; b) regularly recorded within the national aid management system; and c) is publically available*

*iv) and inclusive, including engagement of sub-national government, civil society and other actors*

### **Proposed adjustments**

- The proposed data source is Global Partnership monitoring. The proposed approach builds on the existing Global Partnership indicator on mutual accountability (indicator 7) and brings in elements of the complementary information on transparency (indicator 4).

- The existing indicator currently specifies and allows for reporting on the inclusiveness of mutual assessment reviews to include sub-national governments, civil society and other national stakeholders. Tracking the inclusive nature of mutual assessment reviews would remain in place.
- To tailor to fragile contexts, consideration would be given to:
  - **Adapting the focus of this indicator from looking at mutual assessment reviews to focusing on the establishment and quality of a mechanism for dialogue on development co-operation.** Consideration could also be given to looking at portfolio reviews within the context of this indicator.
  - **Adding a question on whether appropriate counterparts engage in the dialogue mechanism/mutual assessment review.** Consideration could also be given to whether international observers are able to participate.
  - **Adding a subsequent question to the existing indicator question on whether a ‘joint regular assessment’ was conducted.** In response to the open working group’s consideration of allowing for flexibility and adaptation to tailor to specific priorities and constraints in planning and accountability tools, a follow up question could be asked on the periodicity of the reviews to those who respond that joint regular assessments take place. The importance of higher frequency of joint regular assessments is that it allows for greater flexibility to adapt planning and accountability tools that is not possible when assessment are not held regularly.
  - **Consideration for whether there is enough space/ the right questions asked to development partners to draw out a response on their view of the effectiveness and quality of the dialogue/mutual accountability reviews.** In the existing indicator, there are currently 5 questions asked to partner countries and 2 to development partners.
  - **Adapting the monitoring process – overall but particularly for this indicator – to account for situations where development partners may not be directly engaged or willing to participate in a multi-stakeholder process on monitoring effectiveness with the government.**
  - Depending on how the placeholder for political dialogue develops, a question could be added on political dialogue at country level.
- To the extent possible, method of calculation would be consistent with current Global Partnership practice; that is, the percentage of countries that meet at least four out of the five dimensions for effective dialogue on development co-operation/mutual assessments (note that the fifth dimension is that the mutual assessment review is established/ takes place).

<b>Political dialogue</b>	<b>Partner country governments engage in regular political dialogue with development partners and civil society</b>
---------------------------	---

### **Background**

Fostering legitimate politics through regular political dialogue was internationally recognized as a foundational step to engaging effectively in fragile situations in 2011<sup>xvi</sup>. The shared commitment to building effective,



accountable and inclusive institutions was then universally adopted in 2015<sup>xvii</sup>. While challenging among other priorities, government and development partner representatives require ample space to regularly engage honestly on the risks, challenges, and opportunities related to development co-operation partnerships and activities. Members of the open working group refer to a 'spectrum' of fragility; from extremely fragile contexts to those that are moderately or less affected by fragility. All constituencies of the open working group – partner countries, development partners and civil society – agree that engaging in political dialogue is critical in all contexts across the spectrum of fragility.

**Proposed approach:** *[Placeholder for political dialogue – distinct from dialogue on development co-operation in that it addresses political concerns, security, legitimacy among other issues – at international, regional, country and/or local level with development partners and civil society, which could be tracked at international, regional and/or country level]*

**Proposed adjustments**

- The proposed approach for this indicator is to be developed. This could be measured at international or regional level, in terms of partner country government responsiveness to, for example, engagement in international/regional fora, responsiveness to human rights or electoral concerns, among other issues. Alternatively, or additionally, this could be captured at country and/or local level through the development of a question that addresses political dialogue at country/local level. Further analysis and consultation is needed to assess whether it would be more useful to track at international, regional, country and/or local level, and subsequently to look in more detail at the possible measurement approaches.
- Method of calculation, data sources and key definitions to be refined.

<b>Alignment with national priorities</b>	<b>Countries strengthen national development planning tools/ frameworks</b>
---	---

**Background**

The open working group emphasized the need to respect and use national priorities to guide development co-operation in order to reinforce country ownership and reduce fragmentation of development activities. National priorities are typically set out in a long-term vision, development plan/strategy, and/or sector/sub-national strategies. In fragile contexts, other tools and frameworks can exist. These can include fragility assessments or national cohesion assessments, portfolio reviews, joint risk assessments, as well as other planning tools that have been inclusively developed with civil society and other national actors by the government (or with the government in extremely fragile contexts) and set out development priorities along with clear targets to track progress. Inclusive processes for setting national priorities are critical to building trust between government and its citizens as well as with development partners, and strengthening country leadership by defining its own development path.

**Proposed approach:** *% of partner country governments that strengthen evidence-based national development planning tools/ frameworks*

*Criteria:*

*i) Whether a national conflict/fragility/risk or other relevant assessment has been conducted through inclusive dialogue with civil society, subnational groups and communities, and whether it has been used to inform and underpin national development planning; or,*

*ii) Whether the national development planning document (if it exists): responds to the issues raised in the national conflict/risk/resilience/cohesion assessment or other relevant assessment; has been developed through inclusive dialogue; is used to define and track the country's development priorities; is monitored regularly and transparently; and, is used to inform decision making*

### **Proposed adjustments**

- The proposed data source is Global Partnership monitoring. The proposed approach builds on the existing Global Partnership indicator on strengthening national results frameworks (indicator 1b).
- To tailor to fragile contexts, this indicator would be **adjusted to assess the use of existing and agreed upon evidence-based planning and programming tools and frameworks** that can provide an evidence base for national development planning. The indicator could capture tools/ frameworks relevant to fragile contexts, including but not limited to fragility assessments, national cohesion assessments, portfolio reviews, climate vulnerability assessments, joint risk assessments, poverty assessments, Country Policy and Institutional Assessments, and other planning tools and frameworks as relevant.
- Where a national conflict/fragility/risk or other relevant assessment has been conducted, **a follow-up question would be asked on the inclusive nature of the assessment** and whether it was informed by dialogue with civil society, subnational groups and communities. Where a national development planning document exists, **a question on whether the assessment has been inform and underpin national development planning would be asked**. For example, in situations where a risk assessment has been completed, a follow-up question could probe whether a risk mitigation strategy has been developed in response to the assessment and embedded within the national development plan.
- With regard to the placeholder for the action area on the development, humanitarian, peace nexus (see page 15), **a question could be added to probe whether the country and its development partners have coordinated their efforts with humanitarian and peace/security counterparts**, and the extent to which prevention and resilience are covered in the development of the country strategy and priorities. This question could be asked of both the country and development partners.
- Consideration could also be given to asking whether gender equality and women's empowerment is: a) addressed in the conflict/fragility/risk or other relevant assessment, or b) a priority in the national development strategy and/or a sector strategy.
- The indicator would consist of four or more criteria. The method of calculation for the indicator would be consistent with current Global Partnership practice; that is, the calculation of an average across the criteria assessed in the questions and expressed as a percentage.

<b>Alignment with national priorities</b>	<b>Development partners use existing country-led development planning and programming tools/ frameworks</b>
---	---

### **Background**

To reduce fragmentation and strengthen country ownership, alignment of development co-operation to national priorities is imperative. The extent to which development partners guide their development efforts in line with country-defined priorities and development results is critical to maintaining a focus on results and achieving long lasting development gains. The existing Global Partnership indicator on development partners' use of country-led results frameworks provides the data on Sustainable Development Goal 17, target 15, which measures the degree of policy space and leadership accorded to a country in establishing its own path towards poverty eradication and sustainable development.

**Proposed approach:** % of development partners that use existing country-led development planning and programming tools/ frameworks

### **Proposed adjustments**

- The proposed data source is Global Partnership monitoring. The proposed approach is a modification of the existing Global Partnership indicator on using country-led results frameworks (indicator 1a).
- To tailor to fragile contexts, **this indicator would be edited to match the broader definition of existing and agreed upon evidence-based development planning and programming tools and frameworks** that underpin or exist in place of the national development strategy/plan. The indicator could capture tools/ frameworks relevant to fragile contexts, including but not limited to fragility assessments, national cohesion assessments, portfolio reviews, climate vulnerability assessments, joint risk assessments, poverty assessments, Country Policy and Institutional Assessments, and other planning tools and frameworks as relevant.
- With regard to the placeholder for the action area on the development, humanitarian, peace nexus (see action area: Humanitarian-development-peace coherence on page 15), **a question could be added to probe whether the country and its development partners have coordinated with humanitarian and peace/security counterparts in the planning and development of their country engagement strategy**, and the extent to which prevention and resilience are addressed in the country strategy. This question could be asked of both the country and development partners.
- Method of calculation would remain consistent with current Global Partnership practice; that is, the calculation of an average across the criteria within this indicator.

<b>Alignment with national priorities / strengthening national capacities</b>	<b>Development partners strengthen national capacities</b>
---	--

### **Background**

One of the central ways for governments to build legitimacy with society - particularly in fragile contexts - is to develop and use country capacities for service delivery, as this is how citizens primarily encounter and shape

their perception of the government<sup>xviii</sup>. Re-establishing core government functions in the aftermath of conflict is critical to build confidence in the government<sup>xix</sup>. The universally agreed 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development explicitly calls for enhanced support for strengthening national capacities<sup>xx</sup>. This includes effective and targeted capacity building in developing countries to support implementation of national development plans, strengthening domestic revenue capacities, and strengthening statistical capacities, among other areas. Jointly assessing which country capacities are the most important to build legitimacy and country ownership is a critical step to subsequently strengthening national capacities in these key areas.

**Proposed approach:** *[placeholder to track the effectiveness of strengthening national capacities to plan, implement and evaluate development activities]*

**Proposed adjustments**

- The proposed approach for this indicator is to be developed. The open working group has stressed that capacity building is particularly important in fragile contexts. Considering that Global Partnership monitoring covers the effectiveness of development co-operation, the measurement approach for strengthening national capacities could focus in on the quality and effectiveness of capacity building efforts. How this could be tracked requires further thinking but would mean going beyond tracking capacity building support/flows. Possible measurements could include a question to development partners in the context of indicator 1A on whether at the planning stage of a development partner's overall country strategy or programme there was an assessment of national capacities and whether weaknesses in capacities were addressed.
- Method of calculation, key definitions and data source to be refined.

Alignment with national priorities	Reduce fragmentation across development actors and activities
------------------------------------	---

**Background**

The open working group stressed the need to reduce the redundancy and overlap of actors and activities – across regional, national and local levels – to reinforce government leadership and legitimacy. Overcrowding and duplication by actors in some sectors or regions can be a result of many development partners responding to similar domestic political imperatives. However, it creates operational confusion and service gaps in overlooked areas. It also reduces the space for government to effectively intervene and lead, and be recognized by its citizens as a source of development. This can in turn undermine the government's legitimacy, despite determined efforts to help establish coherence around national priorities across a country. Increasing co-ordination across actors and activities can reduce the number of parallel implementation units and systems and eases the effort to streamline or redirect assistance so that partners are working to their comparative advantage.

**Proposed approach:** *[Placeholder to for measurement approach to track the reduction of fragmentation of actors and activities]*

**Proposed adjustments**

- To address fragmentation, consideration could be given to the establishment of aid co-ordination forums, their level (High-Level, Technical Level), and the frequency of meetings. Given that this is covered under mutual accountability, if possible fragmentation could be addressed together with the existing proposal under mutual accountability.
- The proposed approach for this indicator is to be developed but would aim to utilize existing global mechanisms to track progress. Method of calculation, key definitions and data source to be refined.

<b>Use of country systems</b>	<b>Countries strengthen the quality of their public financial management systems</b>
-------------------------------	--

### **Background**

Strong public financial management systems are foundational to country leadership through effective governance. However, conflict, corruption, weak legitimacy, and/or weak institutional capacities can be cited as limitations to using a countries' key financial management systems (e.g. budget management and execution, financial reporting, auditing and procurement). Strengthening the quality of public financial management systems is critical to effective public administration and the implementation of development efforts.

**Proposed approach:** % of partner countries that have improved the quality of their public financial management systems

### **Proposed adjustments**

- The proposed approach is the existing Global Partnership indicator on quality of countries' public financial management systems (indicator 9a). The proposed data source is the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability tool (PEFA).
- Importantly for fragile contexts, the indicator tracks incremental progress regardless of the starting point. Any improvements made regardless of the baseline grade are marked as such.
- Method of calculation would be consistent with current Global Partnership practice; that is, calculated score across nine key PEFA dimensions.

<b>Use of country systems</b>	<b>Development partners use and strengthen country systems</b>
-------------------------------	--

### **Background**

Closely linked to strengthening national capacities, the open working group stressed the need to measure incremental use of country systems to track progress toward more comprehensive use of country systems. As established by CABRI<sup>xxi</sup>, there are many dimensions of using country systems to build national capacity. The existing Global Partnership indicator on this topic measures the proportion of development cooperation disbursed to the public sector using the partner country government's national norms, procedures and systems

for budget management and execution, financial reporting, auditing and procurement. The proposed approach aims at measuring incremental progress toward the use of country systems.

**Proposed approach:** *Use and strengthen of country systems, through incremental tracking of:*

*Sub-elements:*

*i) Disbursements to the public sector as a proportion of total bilateral disbursements in country*

*ii) Share of development co-operation funds planned for the country's public sector that was recorded in the annual budget submitted for legislative approval*

*iii) Core support to national civil society organisations*

*iv) Development co-operation flows that are channeled through country public financial management and procurement systems as a proportion of disbursements to the public sector*

**Proposed adjustments**

- The proposed data source is Global Partnership monitoring. The proposed approach builds on the existing Global Partnership indicator on development partners use of country public financial management and procurement systems (indicator 9b) and existing Global Partnership indicator on whether development co-operation is recorded on budget (indicator 6).
- While **sub-element i) of the proposed approach is not currently reported, this information is already collected by the Global Partnership** and would not require additional reporting. **Sub-element ii) is the existing Global Partnership monitoring approach for indicator 6. Sub-element iii) is new**, and could also consider support to national co-ordinating structures for civil society organisations. **Sub-element iv) is the existing Global Partnership monitoring approach for indicator 9b.**
- For the sub-elements that are already covered in Global Partnership monitoring, the method of calculation would be consistent with current Global Partnership practice.

Humanitarian-development-peace coherence	[Placeholder for indicator on humanitarian-development-peace coherence]
--	---

Noting several international initiatives under development in this area, this remains a placeholder for which a monitoring approach could be developed once agreed actions to address this challenge are in place. **Consideration will also be given to how this work can feed into the monitoring of the recently adopted DAC Recommendation on Humanitarian–Development–Peace Nexus.**

Building on the interlinkages with the New Deal as set out in the first paper of the open working group<sup>xxii</sup>, a monitoring approach that could be implemented in the interim **could be to include a question on development planning coherence across humanitarian, development and peace actors within the context of setting national development priorities/ strategies.** This could probe whether the country and its development partners have coordinated their efforts with humanitarian and peace/security counterparts, and the extent to which prevention and resilience are covered in the development of the country strategy and priorities. This question could be asked of both the country and development partners in the context of indicator 1A and 1B.

---

<sup>i</sup> The work of the Global Partnership is based on the four shared principles of effective development co-operation. These principles were agreed in 2011 by more than 160 countries and 50+ organisations in the Busan Partnership Agreement, the outcome the Fourth High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (Busan, South Korea). For more information, see here: <http://effectivecooperation.org/about/principles/>

<sup>ii</sup> 2016 OECD States of Fragility: Understanding violence, can be accessed at <http://www.oecd.org/dac/states-of-fragility-2016-9789264267213-en.htm>

<sup>iii</sup> See Chapter 2 of the OECD 2018 States of Fragility report, which can be found at: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/states-of-fragility-2018-9789264302075-en.htm>

<sup>iv</sup> Recognising that transitioning out of fragility is not linear and the effectiveness principles would be applied as appropriate and according to country context.

<sup>v</sup> 44 of the 55 countries included in the 2016 OECD States of Fragility report, as well as 18 of the 20 g7+ countries participated in the 2016 Global Partnership monitoring round. In addition, at the time of writing, 45 of the 58, including 12 of the 15 extremely fragile contexts, detailed in the 2018 OECD States of Fragility report are participating in the 2018 monitoring round.

<sup>vi</sup> 2016 Nairobi Outcome Document: <http://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/OutcomeDocumentEnglish.pdf>

<sup>vii</sup> A comprehensive review of the existing indicators took place from April 2017 to May 2018. The review was guided by the Nairobi Outcome Document, technical advice from the Monitoring Advisory Group and the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team, lessons learned in the 2016 monitoring round, which included feedback from participating countries and online consultations that generated around 300 comments and suggestions. The refinement began in April 2017 and drew on the technical assistance of expert groups related to specific thematic areas, iterative consultations with relevant stakeholders, and country-level testing. For more information, see here: <http://effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/openconsultation/>

<sup>viii</sup> The concept note is available online here: <https://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Fragility-background-note.pdf>. More information on this work can be found here: <http://effectivecooperation.org/monitoring-country-progress/global-partnership-monitoring-2-0/track-2-adapting-monitoring-to-new-challenges/>

<sup>ix</sup> These constituencies are members of the International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (IDPS), which is composed of members of the International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF), the g7+ group of fragile and conflict-affected states, and the Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (CSPPS). The IDPS has been closely engaged in the development of the tailored monitoring approach. The representatives of the IDPS implementation working group are also part of the open working group.

<sup>x</sup> Partner country consultation has been facilitated through feedback to the 2016 monitoring round; country visits during the refinement of the monitoring indicators prior to the 2018 monitoring round; and, engagement with countries in fragile situations during the 2018 monitoring round. It has also benefitted from strong engagement from the g7+ and its Member States. For more information and a list of the Member States, please see: <http://g7plus.org/>

<sup>xi</sup> The Development Assistance Committee has been engaged via outreach to the International Network on Conflict and Fragility (INCAF), including updates provided at the May and November INCAF Task Team meetings, as well as several consultation meetings with development partners participating in the 2018 monitoring round at headquarters and with staff based in the field.

<sup>xii</sup> The Civil Society Platform for Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (CSPPS) is engaged on the open working group, and the CSO Task Team, which is a Global Partnership Initiative, was briefed on the development of the tailored monitoring approach. In addition, independent expertise from the Institute for State Effectiveness was also drawn on in co-authoring the two parts of the discussion papers that emanated from working group discussions. Part 1 of the paper can be found here: [https://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/OWG\\_Part-1-draft\\_8-Oct.pdf](https://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/OWG_Part-1-draft_8-Oct.pdf); Part 2 can be accessed here: [https://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/OWG\\_Part-2-draft\\_16-Nov.pdf](https://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/OWG_Part-2-draft_16-Nov.pdf)

<sup>xiii</sup> The open working group is comprised of partner countries that have experienced or are in fragile situations, development partners that work closely with countries in fragile situations, and a representative civil society organization that coordinates across fragile contexts. For a list of the members on the open working group please see the meeting summaries, which can be found here: <https://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/OWG-10-Sept-meeting-summary.pdf>

<sup>xiv</sup> A mapping of international commitments and discussion of the four challenges can be found in Part 1 of the open working group paper (link above in endnote x).

<sup>xv</sup> OECD 2018 States of Fragility report can be found at the link above (endnote xiii).

<sup>xvi</sup> New Deal for engagement in fragile states (2011) can be accessed here:

[https://www.pbsdialogue.org/media/filer\\_public/07/69/07692de0-3557-494e-918e-18df00e9ef73/the\\_new\\_deal.pdf](https://www.pbsdialogue.org/media/filer_public/07/69/07692de0-3557-494e-918e-18df00e9ef73/the_new_deal.pdf)

<sup>xvii</sup> Sustainable Development Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. More information can be found here: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg16>

---

<sup>xviii</sup> United Nations, World Bank (2018) Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict. The report can be accessed at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10986/28337>

<sup>xix</sup> United Nations, World Bank (2017) Rebuilding Core Government Functions in Fragile and Conflict Affected Settings: Joint Principles for Assessing Key Issues and Priorities

<sup>xx</sup> For example, SDG targets 17.1, 17.8, 17.9, 17.15, 17.18, 17.19.

<sup>xxi</sup> Collaborative Africa Budget Reform Initiative (2008) Putting Aid on Budget, accessed at [https://www.cabri-sbo.org/uploads/files/Documents/report\\_2008\\_cabri\\_transparency\\_and\\_accountability\\_use\\_of\\_country\\_systems\\_english\\_putting\\_aid\\_on\\_budget\\_-\\_good\\_practice\\_note\\_-\\_using\\_country\\_systems.pdf](https://www.cabri-sbo.org/uploads/files/Documents/report_2008_cabri_transparency_and_accountability_use_of_country_systems_english_putting_aid_on_budget_-_good_practice_note_-_using_country_systems.pdf)

<sup>xxii</sup> The first paper of the open working group - Part 1 - can be found here: [https://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/OWG\\_Part-1-draft\\_8-Oct.pdf](https://effectivecooperation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/OWG_Part-1-draft_8-Oct.pdf) ;